

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of any changes to the claims and the remarks herein. Please contact the undersigned to conduct a telephone interview in accordance with MPEP 713.01 to resolve any remaining requirements and/or issues prior to sending another Office Action. Relevant portions of MPEP 713.01 are included on the signature page of this amendment.

Claim Objections

Claims 104, 106 and 107 have been objected to. These claims have been amended to overcome this objection. Withdrawal is respectfully requested.

The office action states that claims 105 and 108 if found allowable, claim 108 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 105. Claim 108 has been amended to overcome this potential objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 49, 81, 90, 91, 96, 103, 104 and 106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eldridge et al (US 6,110,823). Applicants respectfully disagree Eldridge teaches no method of forming the structure as originally claimed. To further prosecution claim 49 has been amended to recite "electrochemical forming: of the dielectric coating. There is clearly no teaching of this in Eldridge.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 49, 81, 90, 91, 96, 103, 104 and 106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldridge et al (US 6,110,823). Applicants respectfully disagree Eldridge teaches no method of forming the structure as originally claimed. Thus the rejected claims cannot be obvious. To further prosecution claim 49 has been amended to recite "electrochemical forming: of the dielectric coating. There is clearly no teaching of this in Eldridge. The

Specification teaches “electrochemical forming: of the dielectric coating at original claims 58 and paragraph 45 of the published application.

Claims 86, 88, 92, 93, 94 and 107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldridge et al (US 6,110,823) in view of Nakata et al (US 5,665,610). Applicants respectfully disagree neither Eldridge nor Nakita alone or in combination teaches any method of forming the structure as originally claimed. To further prosecution claim 49 has been amended to recite “electrochemical forming: of the dielectric coating. Claims 86, 88, 92, 93, 94 and 107 depend directly or indirectly from claim 49 There is clearly no teaching of this in Eldridge or Nakita

In view of the remarks herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the above-identified application. If the Examiner wishes to discuss the application further, or if additional information would be required, the undersigned will cooperate fully to assist in the prosecution of this application.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper and any previous paper to deposit account 09-0468.

If the above-identified Examiner's Action is a final Action, and if the above-identified application will be abandoned without further action by applicants, applicants file a Notice of Appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences appealing the final rejection of the claims in the above-identified Examiner's Action. Please charge deposit account 09-0468 any fee necessary to enter such Notice of Appeal.

In the event that this amendment does not result in allowance of all such claims, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

MPEP 713.01 states in part as follows:

Where the response to a first complete action includes a request for an interview or a telephone consultation to be initiated by the examiner,... the examiner, as soon as he or she has considered the effect of the response, should grant such request if it appears that the interview or consultation would result in expediting the case to a final action.

By: /Daniel P. Morris/
Dr. Daniel P. Morris, Esq.
Reg. No. 32,053
Phone No. (914) 945-3217

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P. O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598